

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY
(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 2F04264-PCT	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/JP2005/001232	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 28 January 2005 (28.01.2005)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 28 January 2004 (28.01.2004)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.		

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 *bis*.1(a).

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70	Date of issuance of this report 22 August 2006 (22.08.2006) Authorized officer Yoshiko Kuwahara e-mail: pt07@wipo.int
---	---

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

PCT

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

2F04264-PCT

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001232

International filing date (day/month/year)

28.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)

28.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☒ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001232

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐

This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language

_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

☐

a sequence listing

☐

table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

☐

in written format

☐

in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

☐

contained in the international application as filed.

☐

filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐

furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001232

Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention

1. ☐ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees the applicant has:
- ☐ paid additional fees
- ☐ paid additional fees under protest
- ☐ not paid additional fees
2. ☒ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.
3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
- ☐ complied with
- ☒ not complied with for the following reasons:

Claims 1-7 and 10-16 form the first group while claims 8, 9, 17 and 18 form the second group. The first group includes a configuration of a gate device defining an installing application, though the said configuration is not included in the second group. Thus the common matter to the first group and the second group is only a configuration to authenticate between a gate device and a secure device.

However, since a search has revealed that an identical configuration to the said "common matter" had been disclosed in the following document, it does not appear to be novel:

Document: JP, 2003-281587, A (SEIKO EPSON CORPORATION), 03 October, 2003 (03.10.03), full text (Family: none)

As a result, this "common matter" has no distinctive technical feature in the meaning of PCT rule 13.2, second paragraph, since it does not exceed the scope of the prior arts.

Therefore, there is no "distinctive technical feature" common to all the inventions relevant to claims 1-18

No technical relations in the meaning of PCT rule 13 can be perceived among those different inventions, since other common matters as would be conceived to be distinctive technical features do not exist in the meaning of PCT rule 13.2, second paragraph.

Therefore, it is made clear that the inventions relevant to claims 1-18 do not comply with the requirement of unity of invention

4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
- ☒ all parts
- ☐ the parts relating to claims Nos. _____

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001232

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	1-7, 9-16	YES
	Claims	8, 17, 18	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-7, 10-16	YES
	Claims	8, 9, 17, 18	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-18	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>Document 1: JP, 2003-281587, A (Seiko Epson Corporation), 03 October, 2003 (03.10.03), full text (Family: none)</p> <p>Document 2: JP, 6-187163, A (Sony Corporation), 08 July, 1994 (08.07.94), full text (Family: none)</p> <p>Document 3: JP, 6-119265, A (Matsushita Electric Industrial Co, Ltd.), 28 April, 1994 (28.04.94), full text & CA, 2106122, A</p> <p>Document 4: JP, 7-200756, A (TOPPAN PRINTING CO., LTD.), 04 August, 1995 (04.08.95), paragraphs [0004], [0005] and [0007] (Family: none)</p> <p>Claim 8 Passing information transmitting device 9, mobile type information processing terminal 7 and door lock release device 10 relevant to document 1 respectively correspond to "a gate device", "a secure device" and "a device for a prescribed motion".</p> <p>The description of document 1, page 4, left column, lines 39-43 corresponds to "an authentication processing" of claim 8, while the description of document 1, page 4, right column, lines 2-4 corresponds to "registration of identification information of a gate device" of claim 8.</p> <p>The description of document 1, page 4, right column, lines 15-16 corresponds to "transmitting the said identification information of a gate device".</p> <p>"Authentication code" described in document 1, page 4, lines 2-3 corresponds to "identification information of a gate device" of claim 8. Because this "authentication code" can only be obtained from a legitimate transit information transmitting device 9, it is possible to identify that by having this "authentication code" a legitimate passing information transmitting device has been passed. Also, varied working examples are disclosed to allocate different authentication codes respectively to multiple passing information transmitting devices in document 1, page 7, right column line 32-34, and in such cases it is possible to identify a passing information transmitting device by each of the different authentication codes. Therefore, claim 8 does not appear to be novel.</p> <p>Claim 9 In order to prevent unauthorized use of mobile type information processing terminals, a technique is widely known to authorize the motion of mobile type information processing terminal by letting users to input an ID and a password (corresponding to "user identification information") and to let them pass with the ID and the password, and it is self-evident to a person skilled in the art to</p>			

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001232

Box No. V

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

determine whether or not the motion of a mobile type information processing terminal can be authorized with this widely known technique. Since other matters are as per mentioned above, claim 9 does not appear to involve an inventive step.

Claim 17

Same as mentioned in claim 8. Therefore, claim 17 does not appear to be novel.

Claim 18

Passing information transmitting device 9, mobile type information processing terminal 7 and door-lock release device 10 respectively correspond to "a gate device", "a secure device" and "a device for a prescribed motion".

The description of document 1, page 4, left column, lines 40-43 corresponds to "processing of authentication" of claim 18.

"A device identification code" of "passing information transmitting device 9" of document 1, page 4, left column, lines 40-42 corresponds to "identification information of a gate device" of claim 18.

"Judgment" of document 1, page 4, left column, line 43 corresponds to "authentication of identification information"

If the above "judgment" succeeds, "authentication code" of document 1, page 4, right column, line 15-16 is transmitted as the result, and the said authentication code corresponds to "information of a success" of claim 18. Therefore, claim 18 does not appear to be novel.

Claims 1-7 and 10-16

Document 2 discloses that multiple ID signal transmitting means arranged inside a building transmit ID signals corresponding to the arranged locations, that a receiver of a personal computer receives the said ID signals and that the said personal computer starts up automatically an application program corresponding to the received ID signals. While the start-up of a program to correspond to a location is disclosed, the program to be started up is decided in reference to the table inside a personal computer. Also, no authentication is made.

Also, while document 3 describes that a mobile terminal registers a location for radio stations relocated and a mobile terminal starts up a program corresponding to an identification number of a radio station registered of its location, the started up program is not designated by a radio station but is decided by a mobile terminal in reference to a table inside a mobile terminal. Further, authentication by a radio station and a mobile terminal is not explicitly described.

Document 4 describes that data represented by "unfinished" is written in a card when authentication succeeds and the said data "unfinished" is re-written as "finished" when a normal use is finished. It also discloses a configuration to correspond to "invalidated" of claim 4 as it discloses what fails authentication so long as data "unfinished" is written in a card in an authentication on next occasion.

However, any of documents 1-4 neither discloses nor indicates a configuration wherein a gate device designates an application to be installed. Therefore, claims 1-7 and 10-16 appear to be novel and to involve an inventive step.